



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

**BEDINGFIELD, ET AL.**

Serial No.: **09/513,005**

Filed **February 25<sup>th</sup>, 2000**

For: **Region-Wide Messaging  
System and Methods  
Including Validation of  
Transactions**

Art Unit: **2645**

Examiner: **Foster**

Attorney  
Docket No. 99018

**RECEIVED**

**JUN 04 2004**

**Technology Center 2600**

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

**AND**

**SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER FOSTER**

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, Virginia

Sir:

The Office Action mailed January 28, 2004 was deemed final. As in the previous Office Action, the final Office Action rejected all of the claims (renumbered as claims 13-30) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,812,639 to *Bartholomew et al.*

Patent Examiner Foster is thanked for the telephone interview conducted May 7, 2004. The topics discussed included the differences between the claimed subject matter and *Bartholomew et al.* Specifically, the differences of the claimed voice mail servers that operate in different geographic regions or are operated by different service providers were contrasted with *Bartholomew et al.*'s voice mailboxes that operate in a generally homogenous network. No agreement was reached during the interview.

Concurrently with the filing of this Amendment and Response, a Request for Continuing Examination (RCE) of this application is filed.